

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

THURSDAY, THE FOURTEENTH DAY OF JULY
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE S.ANANDA REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO: 15262 of 2005

Between:

A. Muralikrishna, S/o. Satyanarayana Murthy,
Bhavanipuram, Vijayawada, Krishna District.

..... PETITIONER

AND

The Managing Director, Tourism House, A.P. Tourism Development
Corporations, 3-5-89, Himayatnagar, Hyderabad.

.....RESPONDENT

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to Issue a writ, order or direction particularly one in the nature of writ of mandamus declaring the action of respondent in not considering petitioner case for promotion as Supervisor in the existing vacancies is arbitrary, illegal, violation of Articles 4 and 6 of the Constitution of India, discrimination and consequently direct the respondent to consider petitioner case for promotion as supervisor by considering his representation dt.5.4.2005.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.K.VENKATESWARLU

Counsel for the Respondent: MR.NANDIGAM KRISHANA RAO

The Court at the admission stage made the following:

ORDER:

-

-

This writ petition is filed by the petitioner aggrieved by the action of the respondent-Corporation in not considering the case of the petitioner for promotion to the post of Supervisor in the existing vacancies.

2. According to the petitioner, he was appointed as a General Helper. Later, he was promoted as House Keeping Staff without monetary benefit on his representation dated 10-10-2002. The grievance of the petitioner is that though other similarly placed persons are being promoted, the case of the petitioner was not being considered. Even though he is eligible for being considered for promotion as Supervisor, the respondent-Corporation is not considering the case of the petitioner. But the respondent-Corporation is considering the cases of other similarly placed persons by pick and choose method. Therefore, sought for appropriate directions.

3 . The learned Standing counsel, however, disputed the claim and also represented that the Corporation is not promoting any of its employees to the higher posts.

4. In view of the above representation, the respondent-Corporation is directed, if it is proposed to consider of any of the employees for promotion, to consider the case of the petitioner also, if the petitioner possessed the eligibility criteria fixed by the respondent-Corporation.

5. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of. No order as to costs.

S.ANANDA REDDY, J

14th July, 2005

SKM

Copy to:

1 The Managing Director, Tourism House, A.P. Tourism Development
Corporations, 3-5-89, Himayatnagar, Hyderabad.

2 Two C.D. Copies.